DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 197 770 JC 810 034

AUTHOR Nelson, Bonnie A.
TITLE The Development of an Experimental Advisement and Registration Process for New Students at Glendale Community College in Summer, 1979.
INSTITUTION Glendale Community Coll., Ariz.
PUB DATE Jun 80
NOTE 84p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; Developmental Studies Programs; *Educational Counseling; Faculty Advisers; Peer Counseling; *Program Development; Program Evaluation; School Holding Power; School Orientation; *School Registration; Screening Tests; Student Employment; Student Placement; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

This five-part report summarizes the development, implementation, and evaluation of an experimental advisement and registration process for new students at Glendale Community College. Part I examines the impetus for the new program in the college's desire to more effectively place students in need of developmental instruction and, then, outlines specific goals of the faculty team charged with designing and implementing the process. Part II discusses the planning methods used by the team and describes the development of each part of the new process, including the altered physical layout of the registration stations, screening procedures, the provision of a shortened process for students who did not desire faculty advising, and procedures for class card distribution and fee payment. Part II also includes a discussion of the administrative difficulties encountered by the team. Part III describes 30 guidance and informational materials developed for use by faculty advisors, student helpers, and registering students. Part IV follows with an evaluation of the revised process based on: (1) written evaluations by students and faculty; and (2) an examination of Fall 1979 attrition rates for new students. Recommendations for improving retention through improved registration and advisement procedures are presented in Part V. (JP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED197770

THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN EXPERIMENTAL ADVISEMENT AND REGISTRATION PROCESS FOR NEW STUDENTS AT GLENDALE COMMUNITY COLLEGE IN SUMMER, 1979

by

Bonnie A. Nelson

Project Director

Glendale Community College

Glendale, Arizona

June, 1980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bonnie A. Nelson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

✓ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

JC 810034

Special appreciation should be given to the faculty members on the original JCEP project team for their professional dedication, well above the call of duty:

Betty Field

John Hanson

Ellen Huft

Marilee Murray

Anna Solley

In addition, four other people should be thanked for their contributions to the success of this experimental project:

Bertha Landrum, Dean of Instruction

Harry Vesely, Associate Dean of Instruction for Occupational Education (and former Director of Research and Development*)

Donald Bilse, Dean of Students (and former Associate Dean, Student Personnel Services*)

Mary Lou Bayless, Registration Office Manager

* The former title applied until July 1, 1979.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

PART I: BACKGROUND OF THE PROJECT 2

THE 1978-79 TRENDS 2
INITIAL PROJECT PROPOSAL 4
THE PROJECT TEAM 6
PROJECT GOALS 7
SUMMARY 8

PART II: THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE NEW ADVISEMENT AND REGISTRATION PROCESS 9

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS 9

1. Team Meetings 9
2. Interviews 9
3. Procedures 10

DEVELOPMENT OF THE NEW PROCESS 10

1. Physical Layout of Advisement and Registration 11
2. Identification of Basic Studies Students 12
3. Orientation 13
4. Testing 14
5. Advisement 15
6. The Express Table 16
7. Computer Tracking of New Students 17
8. Class Card Pick-Up 18
9. Packet Check 19
10. Fee Payment, Etc. 20
11. The Student Activities Fair 20
12. The "Help Us" Questionnaire 21
13. Use of Student Workers 22
14. Training of Faculty Advisors 23
15. Training of Student Workers 23
16. Summary of the New Process 24

DIFFICULTIES WHICH AROSE FOR THE TEAM 25

1. Difficulties in Relation to the District Administration 25
2. Difficulties Which Arose on the Campus Level 27
3. Miscellaneous Pressures and Frustrations Faced by the Team 30

The team was overworked and underpaid 30
The team became extremely fatigued 30
There was a lack of cooperation by other groups on campus 30
The paperwork required by the budget was time-consuming 30
The project director had to handle all clean-up matters 31

4. Implication of the Team's Difficulties 31

SUMMARY 31

PART III: MATERIALS DEVELOPED FOR FACULTY ADVISORS, STUDENT HELPERS, AND REGISTERING STUDENTS, AND THEIR USE 33

MATERIALS FOR FACULTY ADVISORS 33

1. Agenda for Faculty Advisor Training Sessions 33
2. Flow Charts of Old and New Registration Processes 34
3. Evaluation of Test Scores 34
4. Error Corrections for Catalog and Class Schedule 34
5. The Three Degree Programs 34
6. Handouts Given to New Students 35
7. Advisor Assignments and Cafeteria Layout 35
8. Advisor Responsibilities 35
9. Basic Studies Assessment Sheet 35
10. Prefix Code List 36
11. Schedule of Advisors 36
12. Material Provided "Table C" (Humanities, Social Science, and General) 36
13. Information about Occupational Programs 36
14. Information about Programs in Science and Mathematics 37
15. Xerox Copy of Catalog 37
16. Evaluation Forms 37

MATERIALS FOR STUDENT WORKERS 37

1. Cover Sheet 38
2. Student Stations, Activities, and Supervisors 38
3. Responsibilities of Student Assistants 38
4. Evaluation of Training Session 38

MATERIALS FOR REGISTERING STUDENTS 39

1. Acceptance Letter 38
2. Notice for the Handicapped 39
3. Self Assessment Scale (SAS) 39
4. Student Planning Sheet (SPS) 39
5. Student Flow Chart and Vocabulary for Survival 40
6. Activities Flyer 40
7. Check Sheets for the Three Degrees 40
8. "Help Us" Questionnaire 40
9. Name Tags 40
10. Class Schedules and Catalogs 40

SUMMARY OF MATERIALS 41

PART IV. EVALUATION OF THE ADVISEMENT AND REGISTRATION PROCESS 42

EVALUATIONS BY FACULTY ADVISORS, ADMINISTRATORS, STUDENT WORKERS, AND REGISTERING STUDENTS 42

1. Evaluations of Advisor Training Session 42
2. Evaluations of Student Worker Training Sessions 46
3. Evaluations of Advisement and Registration by Faculty Advisors 46
4. Evaluations by Administrators and Others 47
5. Evaluations by Registering Students 48

EVALUATION OF RETENTION RATES FOR NEW STUDENTS IN THE FALL, 1979 SEMESTER 49

1. Characteristics of New Students Who Participated in the Special Registration 50

Advised Students 50
Basic Studies Students 50
Express Students 50
Other New Students 50
Composite Groups 51
Summary, Table of New Student Characteristics: Fall, 1979 Registrations 51

2. Analysis of Retention Data 51

Data on Complete Withdrawals 52
Data on Completion of Attempted Courses 53
Data on Grade Point Average 54
Trends Suggested by the Data 55

3. Summary of Data Presented in Tables 55
4. Tables Showing Retention Rates for Fall, 1979 Semester 56

Table I. Comparison of Complete Withdrawals by New Students During Fall Semester, 1979 57
Table II. Comparison of Complete Withdrawals by New Day Students With New Evening Students for Fall Semester, 1979 58
Table III. Comparison of Credit Hours Completed by New Students During Fall Semester, 1979 59
Table IV. Comparison of Credit Hours Completed by New Day Students with New Evening Students for Fall Semester, 1979 60
Table V. Comparison of Credit Hours Completed by Part-Time New Students with Full-Time New Students for Fall Semester, 1979 61
Table VI. Comparison of Average G.P.A. of New Students in Fall Semester, 1979 62

EVALUATION BY PROJECT DIRECTOR 63

SUMMARY 64

PART V: RECOMMENDATIONS BY PROJECT DIRECTOR 65

THE ADVISEMENT AND REGISTRATION COMMITTEE 65

RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE PROJECT DIRECTOR/ COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON 67

1. The College Must Formulate a Clear Concept of Academic Advising 67
2. Strong Administrative Support is Necessary for a Successful Advising Program 67
3. A Cluster Approach to Advisement of New Students is Valuable 68
4. Thorough Training of Faculty Advisors is Essential 68
5. Adequate Advising Materials Must Be Available 69
6. After the Experimental Period in Which the Process of Advisement is Developed, the Process Should Be Institutionalized 69
7. Formal Advising Should Be Available for All Students Throughout their College Experience 69
8. A Research Project on the Effect of Advising Should be Carried Out 70

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS 70

SUMMARY 71

NOTE: Selected materials discussed in the text are available upon request.

INTRODUCTION

The following paper is an account of the development, implementation, and evaluation of changes made in the advisement and registration process for new students at Glendale Community College in Summer, 1979. It also provides an overview of additional changes made during the 1979-80 academic year. The paper is divided into five parts. Part I gives background information about the origins of the project, its objectives and outcomes, the make-up of the project team, and the goals the team set for itself. Part II explains how the new advisement and registration process was developed and describes this process. Part III describes the materials that were developed and how they were used by faculty advisors, student helpers, and registering students. Part IV contains an analysis of evaluations completed by campus administrators, faculty advisors, student workers, and registering students, as well as an analysis of the data on new student retention in Fall 1979. Part V gives an overview of the changes made in the 1979-80 academic year and recommendations by the project director for procedures which might strengthen the process of entrance and retention for community college students.

Although the main purpose of this paper is to describe the development of the new advisement and registration process, the project director believes there is another aspect to be considered. The discussions of the team's make-up, attitudes, and working methods, as well as the various difficulties the team encountered, should be of value to both administration and faculty in planning similar faculty projects in the future.

PART I

BACKGROUND OF THE PROJECT

During the 1978-79 academic year, several trends converged to influence the development of a plan for revising the advisement and registration procedures for new students at Glendale Community College. At the time the Summer, 1979 project to implement this plan was first proposed, no one foresaw the extent of change that would result, nor the long-range recommendations which would later be made. Initial planning for the summer project began in February, 1979; the project itself began in May, 1979; and in August, 1979 over 6000 students (4515 of them new students) went through a significantly revised advising and registration process. The success of this new process, and the enthusiasm for it expressed by campus administration, faculty advisors, students, and the project team resulted in the creation of an Advisement and Registration Committee in the Fall, 1979 semester which was charged with planning and making recommendations for future advisement and registration procedures. Based on the experimental work in August, this committee instituted permanent changes, beginning with the January, 1980 registration period for new students. Other long-range planning on the part of the committee is aimed at applying the results of these changes to related college procedures, such as the advisement and registration of continuing students, the drop/add process, a permanent assignment of students to advisors, etc.

The rest of Part I will discuss the various trends which led to the project and describe the project proposal, the make-up of the project team, and the goals which the team developed.

1978-79 TRENDS Six trends can be identified in the Maricopa County community

College District and on the Glendale Community College campus which provided a basis for the decision to carry out the Summer, 1979 project.

1. By the time the Fall, 1978 semester began, the Maricopa County Community College District had formulated the Joint Council on Educational Priorities (JCEP) for long-range planning in the District. Among the 13 priorities listed, several are pertinent to the later development of this experimental project: developmental education, student personnel services, student retention, assessment and identification of the clientele to be served, delineation of functions and responsibilities, staff development, and evaluation. Among these, the concerns about developmental education and about retention were of prime importance to the planning for academic advisement and registration.

2. During the summer of 1978, Glendale Community College was selected to participate in the University of Texas Kellogg Project to Improve Teaching and Learning in Community Colleges. The Kellogg Project emphasized the strengthening of developmental education at G.C.C.

3. G.C.C. was also selected to work with Arizona State University on a three-year project sponsored by the National Institute of Education to explore basic literacy, lending force to G.C.C.'s concern with Developmental Studies (later called Basic Studies) and related aspects of G.C.C.'s programs and procedures.

4. Long-range planning occurred at both the District and college level. At the District level, the Tadlock Associates Long Range Planning Study identified Developmental Studies as a major institutional need for the District. In addition, G.C.C. developed a long-range plan which identified a number of activities to be increased or at least maintained. The following had special import for the summer project: expand student follow-up studies and develop improved methods for follow-up; expand retraining and staff development; expand

orientation; expand educational testing; expand educational and personal consultation and advisement; maintain the generation of registration materials; modify the registration procedures; expand student self assessment; and expand services to educationally disadvantaged students (mature students, students with learning difficulties, etc.).

5. The administration at G.C.C. became interested in revising the registration process early in the Spring, 1979 semester. In particular, the Associate Dean, Student Personnel Services was instrumental in getting the effort started. As a result, in early August, 1979, an experimental registration was planned and incorporated into the G.C.C. calendar for Summer, 1979.

6. The Developmental Studies Planning Team at G.C.C. proposed two new "block" programs, to be instituted in the Fall, 1979 semester. These were to be 12-credit coordinated programs consisting of English, reading, math, counseling, and tutorial components, intended for students currently at low levels of academic skills. Thus, the need arose to develop both an effective way of identifying these Basic Studies students, and proper methods for advising and registering them. Along with this, the need to better identify and place all other students at developmental levels in English and reading was recognized.

As a result of these six converging trends, in February, 1979 the Dean of Instruction asked a member of the Developmental Studies Planning Team to direct a summer project to modify the advisement and registration process for new students, for implementation in early August, 1979.

INITIAL PROJECT PROPOSAL. The project director, the Coordinator of Developmental Studies and Staff Development, and the Director of Research and Development began initial planning in March, 1979. The original intention was to request G.C.C. funding as a campus Educational Development Project, but because District JCEP funds might be available, the proposal was redirected to the Office

of the District Vice Chancellor for Educational Development. The proposal was submitted to District in April, 1979, but was turned down. A series of revisions then occurred to clarify the goals and activities of the project, and eventually on July 10, 1979 (less than three weeks before the actual advisement and registration occurred!) the project was approved by District. By that time, the JCEP funding had been cut and covered only a small amount for supplies, plus pay for both faculty advisors and student workers during the registration period. The six weeks pay which the six-member project team received was paid from campus Educational Development funds.

As the various versions of the proposal evolved, a time line was developed for the project covering several objectives, as follows:

1. To examine by July 27, 1979 the purpose for which each developmental course was intended and to establish the proper criteria for student enrollment.
2. To design by August 16, 1979 an efficient and effective matriculation process for the new student entering Glendale Community College.
3. To design and present by July 30, 1979 an effective one-day training program for campus faculty and staff who will serve as advisors to new students.
4. To provide, between July 31 and August 10, assessment and advising services to 5000 new students who will enter the college in the Fall of 1979.
5. To develop an effective means of evaluating the revised process of new student matriculation by August 16, 1979.

Eleven outcomes of these objectives were also identified:

1. 5000 new students will receive efficient advising for classes to take during their initial semester at Glendale.
2. 750 new students who need one or more "developmental" courses to insure their success will be properly advised as to what course or courses to take.
3. 5000 students will be more aware of campus services designed to assist them with educational and personal needs.
4. Campus literature will more accurately explain opportunities for students with deficient basic skills.
5. Campus offices which share responsibility in the matriculation process will have a greater awareness of their role and the role of other offices.

6. Attrition, as a result of inefficient advising, will be reduced.

7. The return rate of new students will be increased.

8. The FTSE[1] generated by the campus in the Fall of 1979 should be the same as might have been expected without this advising program. It should reflect the lighter schedules attempted by new students who have received improved advising, but, because of a lower rate of attrition, more of those students will still be enrolled on the 45th day. In subsequent semesters, FTSE should be increased over that which could be expected without this advising program.

9. A one-day program and materials will have been created and can be delivered as often as is needed for the orientation of new faculty advisors.

10. Faculty will better understand their role in the matriculation process.

11. Faculty will better understand the student population at Glendale Community College.

THE PROJECT TEAM. The project director found the choice of team members was unusually fortunate. Together, the project director and the Coordinator of Developmental Studies and Staff Development assembled a six-member team, consisting of the project director (a philosophy instructor), the Coordinator of Developmental Studies and Staff Development (a math instructor), the Director of the Learning Assistance Center, a counselor, a psychology instructor, and a chemistry instructor. The first four of these faculty members had been members of the Developmental Studies Planning Team in 1978-79 and shared an interest in developing a Basic Studies program at Glendale, as well as a desire to improve the advisement and registration process for all students. The latter two joined the team because of their interest in humanizing and improving the advisement and registration process, and not out of any particular interest in Basic Studies.

From the viewpoint of the project director, the very amateur status of the project team was perhaps one of its best assets. Although four of the team members were familiar with the planning for Basic Studies programs on the campus,

[1] Full-Time Student Equivalency.

no team member was in any way an "expert" about the advisement and registration process. Their "expertise" consisted of years of orienting students, working as faculty advisors, handing out cards at registration, etc. However, all members of the team were student-oriented, and this shared attitude served to draw them together into a warm and effective group. This good working relationship, combined with their ignorance of the magnitude of their undertaking, enabled the team members to successfully cope with the series of difficulties they encountered throughout the summer.

Another important consideration in understanding why the team was able to function effectively is that from the beginning the project was under complete faculty control. Although access to funds, supplies, and even secretarial help was greatly limited and proper channels of administrative authority were not well understood by the team, the absence of administrative direction and/or control enabled the team to be innovative. The campus administration provided constant support throughout the project: administrators who did not even know until early in July what the team would recommend to them were consistently willing to provide information and encouragement throughout the planning period, and they gave enthusiastic approval for all the recommendations the team made in July. This freedom from administrative control, combined with administrative support, was important in helping the team surmount the many problems it faced.

PROJECT GOALS. Early in the planning period the team determined three major goals for its work. In the months of discussion and modification before August, 1979 these remained its guide, as they still do for the college Advisement and Registration Committee which has replaced the original team. These goals are:

1. The advisement and registration process should always show appreciation for students as people for whom the college exists to serve.

2. The college should strive for better placement of students in English and reading classes (especially those who need work in Basic Studies).

3. All students should have thorough and helpful advising to better meet their needs.

Throughout their planning, the team members believed strongly that G.C.C. exists for the students, and that emphasis on proper placement and advising for Basic Studies students is justified by the open door policy of the District and the needs of G.C.C.'s students. The team shared the concern of both campus and District about retention, but always in the context of its belief that to provide education for students, G.C.C. must show them that it can provide a dignified and effective means for their own personal and intellectual growth.

SUMMARY. Part I has highlighted several trends that affected the development of the idea for an improved advisement and registration for new students, and has delineated specific goals for the project. Part II will illustrate the impact of some of these trends on the planning process and describe procedures for implementing the project goals.

PART II

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE NEW ADVISEMENT AND REGISTRATION PROCESS

Two aspects of the project will be described in this section: (1) the development of the new process for advisement and registration designed to meet the team's goals and proposed objectives, and (2) the difficulties which arose for the team while the process was being developed. For both of these, critical comments will be provided where appropriate.

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS. Before discussing the development of the new process, a few brief remarks should be made about the planning methods used by the team.

1. Team Meetings. Throughout the planning period (May 15 through July 27, 1979) the project team met as a group 16 times to discuss, evaluate, modify, and/or reach a consensus on procedures and materials for the new process. In addition, there were many more meetings of two or three team members for work on specific sub-group assignments. The results of these assignments were then brought back to the entire team for approval. During the planning period, the project director had frequent contact with individual campus administrators and the Registration Office Manager. This contact increased considerably as the July 30 deadline neared. The entire team met with campus administrators on July 10, 1979 to present the new procedures for their approval.

2. Interviews. At its initial meeting, the team decided to interview campus personnel (deans, directors of student services, student leaders) who might have pertinent suggestions for the development of new advisement and registration procedures. A list of these personnel was made, and during late May, 1979

team members conducted the interviews. Reports of the interviews were then written and distributed to all team members for their analysis. At a later meeting the major concerns and suggestions indicated in these reports were recorded on a large butcher-board sheet which, for easy reference throughout the summer, was posted on a wall in the conference room used for team meetings. This record became the basis for the development of the new procedures. Although not all of the concerns of those interviewed were met, and not all of their suggestions could be implemented, the final process addressed most of them.

3. Procedures. The team did not develop the various parts of the new process in any definite order. Rather, as a new component of the process was introduced for discussion and planning (e.g., the physical layout of registration), the team directed attention to it without first finishing work on other aspects of the process previously considered. This was probably due in part to the informal working habits of the team, but it was also a function of the planning process itself. Time pressures precluded a leisurely assessment of each phase of development in its turn, and as the various phases occurred, new modifications of other related phases became necessary. Thus, an organic growth of the overall process occurred, rather than a linear development of ideas. Although the time line was not as orderly as the team had intended it to be in its proposal, this approach allowed maximum creativity throughout the planning period, without constraints being imposed until quite near the end of that part of the project.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE NEW PROCESS. The following is an account of the development of each part of the new advisement and registration process. Materials referred

to will be discussed in more detail in Part III.

1. Physical Layout of Advisement and Registration. To meet the team goals, major changes in the physical layout of registration were made. In addition to identification of Basic Studies students, the team was concerned to make all students as comfortable as possible while they went through registration. The intent was to create a friendly atmosphere for new students where they would feel welcome and could complete registration with minimal inconvenience. The team felt that whenever possible students should not have to wait for help and accurate information should be easily available to them. This translated into two objectives: to create a physical system which would be convenient as well as efficient, and to inclucate a friendly and helpful attitude in all faculty, staff, and student workers who would be involved in the advisement and registration process.

To meet the goals of convenience and efficiency, the physical layout of registration was designed to use as few locations as possible, to allow easy access to faculty advisors over a maximum time span, and to facilitate retracing of steps when necessary. The various steps in the entire process were organized into two parts. Part I, consisting of packet pick-up, orientation, and testing would be conducted in one location where appropriate rooms were available for each activity. Part II would be conducted in another location with suitable facilities for advisement, class card pick-up, fee payment and related matters, and the Student Activities Fair. Thus, two buildings would be used to cover the complete registration process.

Discussions about the physical layout brought to the team's attention a major problem with past registrations: the location of advising tables, class cards, and the screens which list open and closed sections. Traditionally, advising had been done in one room and class card pick-up had been done in

another room of the same building. The screens listing open and closed sections were in the same room as the advising tables, although not near enough to the advisors to be of use to them. Students would see an advisor, then sit near the screens to check open and closed sections, and then go to the other room to get their class cards. Often, there was a substantial delay between the time a section was closed and the time this information was posted on the screens. This delay in providing information was a serious inconvenience to the students, and to improve the situation the team decided to place advisors, screens, and class cards all in one room where students could have easy access to all of them as needed.

2. Identification of Basic Studies Students. The goal of better identification of developmental students (hereafter called Basic Studies students) forced the team to design a more adequate screening procedure for placement in English and reading courses. The use of ACT English and Social Science scores and the CGP placement test given by G.C.C. was retained, but three additional screening steps were introduced. First, if the student achieved a Social Science score of 10 or less on the ACT, or 16 or less on the CGP, he/she would be further evaluated in an interview with a faculty member, using a specially designed Basic Studies instrument which included both a series of questions given orally and a writing sample. Students for whom the English language presented severe difficulties, and who therefore could not complete the CGP, would also follow this procedure. As a result of this interview, the faculty member would then direct the student either to the Basic Studies advisors at registration or to one of the regular advising tables, depending on the interview findings.

Second, students who scored above these minimal scores but below the level required for English 101[1] would also be sent by their advisors to the Basis

[1]The cutoff scores for English 101 are 35 on the ACT and 26 on the CGP.

Studies advisors for placement in appropriate English and/or reading courses. The reason for this was that the team wanted to improve placement of all students in English and reading courses, and accurate placement at the remedial level could best be done by specially trained faculty.

Third, a Basic Studies advising table was introduced where carefully selected faculty, primarily those with experience in teaching Basic Studies courses, would make a final evaluation of all students identified in either of the above two ways. Actual placement of students in Basic Studies courses would be done only by these faculty members. Two benefits would result from this new procedure. Those most expert in evaluating English and reading skills would place students in appropriate remedial courses in those disciplines. And, other advisors who did not have the necessary background to make these decisions would be relieved of the responsibility.

3. Orientation. In former years, the Counseling Department had given orientation sessions for new students throughout the summer prior to fall registration. However, student attendance at these sessions was generally low. To improve attendance, and to make it possible for the student to complete all steps in registration in one day, the team decided to build orientation into the registration process. Examination of the content of the orientation sessions showed that two distinct topics were traditionally covered. One topic was registration information; the other student services information. It seemed to the team that covering both topics in orientation sessions at the time of registration would be ineffective due to student impatience about continuing with registration as soon as possible. So the team decided that the traditional orientation material should be split into two parts. The part which explained how to register and the role of advisors would be kept in the new process as the content of a shortened orientation. The part which

explained services available to students on campus would be deleted from orientation. Instead, a Student Activities Fair at the end of registration would make students aware of these services.

4. Testing. Students who had not taken either the ACT or COP placement tests would be able to do so immediately after orientation. The team also wanted to give new students an opportunity before they registered to review their personal preferences and skills, their goals and personal resources for achieving them, as well as an opportunity to develop a tentative plan for the coming semester which would realistically consider time commitments at home and work in addition to their academic time requirements. Thus, the team built in a period at the end of the testing when students could complete two forms, the Student Assessment Scale (SAS) and the Student Planning Sheet (SPS). The intent was that the student could complete these while the placement tests were being scored. Then, after the scores had been recorded and given to the student, he/she would take the scores, the SAS, and the SPS to an advisor, and together they could use these tools to develop a program and schedule which would best meet the needs of the student. Students who already had test scores on file would still complete the SAS and SPS before advisement.

The team did little to modify the testing procedures themselves, and in retrospect this seems a weakness in the development of the new process. Little consideration was given to the attitudes and behavior of the testing clerks, although the team was aware of the anxiety students feel when in a testing situation. Part of the difficulty was the inadequate communication between the team and the Counseling Department (which oversees testing on the campus) due to time pressures on the team. Part of the difficulty may also have been due to the assumption by the project director that because a counselor was on the team, communication with the Counseling Department was

satisfactory. It was not. The result was that the testing procedures were not satisfactorily integrated into the new process. Rather, rigid rules for when students could begin the tests, combined with some insensitivity on the part of some of the testing clerks, inconvenienced and irritated many students.

5. Advisement. During the Spring, 1979 semester, prior to the beginning of the team's work, the Dean of Instruction sent out a memo to all faculty, informing them that there would be a special experimental advisement and registration early in August, and asking them to fill in a form and return it if they were interested in working as advisors (for pay) during that time. Twenty five faculty members returned the form, and all of them subsequently were used as advisors. Some months before that, the campus administration set the dates of the experimental registration as July 30 - August 10, 1979 - a total of eight full days (11 a.m. - 9 p.m.) and two half days (8:30 - 11:30 a.m.). The number of advisors seemed adequate to serve the estimated 5000 students who would register during that period, and, in any case, the budget only allowed for that number to be paid. However, not all departments would be represented in advisement, although each major area of instruction would be covered. That is, some advisors would represent social science, some the humanities, some the sciences, some business, and some the occupational areas. The team, therefore, evolved a "cluster" plan for advising in which three major areas of instruction (Business, Science/Technology, and Humanities/Social Science) would be served by a cluster of advisors who could work with students whose interests fell in that area. The notion of cluster advising was more a result of the need to provide advising in a variety of disciplines while having only a limited and incomplete representation of those disciplines, that an intentional change in the traditional advising by departments. However,

cluster advising proved to be a fundamental change in the registration process, and this idea paved the way for later substantial modifications in both the mechanics and the goals of the entire advising process of the school.

It is interesting to note that during the summer the team did not address the content of the advising to be done in the clusters which it had designed. Rather, almost until the actual beginning of registration, the team largely ignored the preparation and training of faculty members for advising in a group of related subject areas. The conventional wisdom of "I know all about disciplines similar to mine" prevailed in the team's thinking. It was the innovative materials hastily prepared in hand-written form by the Associate Dean of Instruction for Occupational Education which first brought into focus the enormity of the task the advisors faced.

Those materials were an attempt to provide at least minimal information about required courses, first semester schedules, critical sequences of courses to be taken, etc. The need for materials, even of this primitive sort, was finally realized when the matter of training the advisors was addressed during the week prior to the beginning of registration! As an additional attempt to provide badly needed information, the Dean of Instruction and one of the team members also prepared some information which would be useful to those advising in the traditional liberal arts areas. Thus, a "quickie sheet" (listing courses which were "sure" transfer courses) and some information about math and science courses were developed. The team did have enough foresight to prepare a ditto'ed list of new courses not in the college catalog.

6. The Express Table. The team was well aware that some students, especially those registering for just one or two courses, would prefer to bypass advising. A special Express table was designed to help them do that, reflecting the team's view that registration should be as easy as possible. The team designed the

overall physical layout so that the registering student was greeted by a student worker upon first entering the cafeteria where advisement and card pick-up occurred. The student worker would direct the student to the appropriate advising table (signs on posts identified each advising cluster) or, if told the student did not wish to be advised, to the Express table. (This procedure would also enable the student worker to identify students with the goldenrod-colored Basic Studies Assessment sheets and send them directly to the Basic Studies table.) Students who chose the Express table would be given information about use of the screens, filling out the cards in their packets, and where to get class cards, but would not be given academic advising. Should they indicate they did indeed need advising, they would be redirected to the appropriate advising cluster. The team intended to schedule a faculty advisor to work the Express table, aided by student workers but in fact, due to the need for them at advising tables, faculty advisors were frequently not available at Express.

7. Computer Tracking of New Students. During the week prior to the beginning of registration, the Associate Dean of Instruction for Occupational Education raised the question of how the college would know what happened to the registering students after they completed the new process. Until then, the team had concentrated its efforts on designing the system and had not given thought to an evaluation of its efforts to improve advising. Once the question was raised, it was obvious that a system should be developed to identify all the new students registered during the experimental process, and to break them down into three categories: Advised students, Basic Studies students, and Express students. Registration numbers on the students' packets would identify continuing students versus new students, and a packet check could separate out only the new students. Further, three different kinds of computer cards (color coded) could be used, one for each of the three categories, and these could be

inserted into the students' packets during advisement (or at the Express table), and could then be used to flag the students in each category. Thus, a tracking system could be set up in the District Office computer, to monitor the progress of all the new students, both in regard to division into the three categories, and individually.

The tracking system that was developed enabled G.C.C. to collect data which is the basis for the retention analysis in Part IV of this paper. The three categories were:

1. Advised students
2. Basic Studies students (who may also have been advised in the regular advising clusters)
3. Express students

This tracking system was retained for the January, 1980 advisement and registration of new students. It has also made longitudinal research possible, by allowing the project director to track samples of each of the three groups, both collectively and individually.

8. Class Card Pick-Up. Traditionally, each department had handed out its own class cards, and frequently much informal advising went on at that point. This was especially true during the later period of a registration, when popular classes and sections were closed and the students had to do substantial schedule modification to find open sections of courses. Early in the summer, the team hit on the idea of putting all the class cards together on one long table, where a student could present his/her schedule card and be given all the cards at once. This seemed a much more efficient procedure than the old one which forced the student to go from department to department for the cards, often having to wait in long lines only to find that the section wanted had closed between the time the student checked the screens listing open and closed sections and the time the student finally was able to ask for the card. Due to the

limited number of faculty available to work the various registration stations, the team decided to assign a few responsible student workers to the class card table. It seemed reasonable to suppose that one student worker could efficiently move along the table, pulling all the class cards a registering student needed at one time.

An adjustment was made, however, as the team continued to plan for better identification of Basic Studies students. The team thought that the class cards for Basic Studies courses should be more accessible to the advisors to ensure that students who needed these courses were actually placed in them. Thus, the team modified the procedure it had initially designed so that the class cards for all sections of Basic Studies courses would be placed on a small table near the Basic Studies advisors. This would enable the faculty advisor to make sure that a student actually could get into a needed Basic Studies class before the rest of the student's schedule was completed. If a needed section should be closed, another open section could be substituted. Only after successfully placing the student in the needed Basic Studies course(s) would the student be allowed to complete plans for other courses.

9. Packet Check. Traditionally, frequent checkpoints with resulting long lines occurred during registration. The team wanted very much to eliminate both of these wherever possible. The new process did this. The only checkpoint the student would have to go through was after he/she had completed everything in the process up to the payment of fees. The team kept this checkpoint because it would be important for the student's sake, and if the flow of registering students could be kept at basically a steady level, there would be no long line at this one checkpoint.

10. Fee Payment, etc. The only room that could easily be used for fee payment, veterans' benefits, financial aid, I.D. cards, and parking stickers was a small conference room near the large room used for advisement and card pick-up. Although the steady flow of students into this room looked good on paper, the flow proved to be less than successful in the actual registration, due to the combination of students with differing needs who had to wait in the same line to get into the conference room. Veterans who needed to stop at their table, as well as financial aid students, waited in the same line with those who merely had to pay their fees. Although usually there were no bottlenecks due to this, there were a few times during the registration when long lines did form - an explicit weakness in the physical design.

11. The Student Activities Fair. The team thought this would be a pleasant and informative end to the registration process, which would make new students feel more comfortable and positive about G.C.C., and which would inform them about various campus activities and services. The plan was to have the various activities and service groups work booths where new students could ask questions about the activities and services, and perhaps pick up some literature.

The team began to think about offering refreshments as a result of its decision to develop the Fair in order to shorten the orientation process. The intent was to encourage the new students to feel comfortable and to take some time to explore the opportunities available to them on campus. Also, it was because of this idea that the team began to consider the physical layout of the registration process in the Student Union Building and came to the conclusion that the Fair should be in the Student Lounge, located in the Student Union. Traditionally, students had not been allowed to eat or drink in the Lounge because of the carpeting and upholstered furniture (although smoking was allowed) and the team's recommendation violated this tradition. It is noteworthy

that the team thought that this break from tradition was important. In fact this minor innovation became a morale-booster! Allowing students to eat and drink in their own Lounge symbolized not only the team's goal to humanize the registration process, but also a change in attitude consistent with that goal.

The team asked the two student governments on campus (day students and evening students) to fund the refreshments. The evening student government had always done this for evening students during registration. Working out the mechanics of serving refreshments proved, however, to be a time-consuming and frustrating minor problem during the registration, a problem which was never fully resolved. Communication between the two student governments appeared to be poor, and the student leaders were not cooperative about resolving the problem.

A further difficulty with the Fair was that the various campus activities and service groups were not enthusiastically responsive. Partly this was a result of the time of year: during the summer many organizations were not active on campus, and although the team sent out memos, and tried to follow them up with personal contact, several groups were not available and were not represented at the Fair. One team member, in particular, did all possible to develop the Fair - preparing signs for the various groups, trying to contact them, etc. - but at best the Fair was a limited success. The team could only hope that in the future it would improve. The most positive aspect was that, in spite of the difficulties, refreshments were indeed available for the registering students.

12. The "Help-Us" Questionnaire. The team designed a questionnaire for the registering students, intended to get their responses to the new process. The questionnaire was to be given to all students at Fee Payment, but there were difficulties with this procedure. First, the staff working Fee Payment frequently did not give out the questionnaire, probably due to both their own

time pressures and to their not understanding the importance of getting feedback from the students. Second, the registering students did not seem to understand the benefit of filling in the questionnaire. Only about 350 students filled it in, even partially, although over 6000 students were registered.

13. Use of Student Workers. Initially, the team considered using students as peer advisors who would handle the more routine aspects of advisement, but as discussion continued throughout the summer, this idea was abandoned. The team was aware of the frequency of informal student advising in the past, and of the comfortable relationships students had with one another in the advising situation. There were two major factors which led to the rejection of peer advising. First, the team was concerned to improve the quality of advising, and was aware (at least dimly!) of the difficulties imposed on faculty members by the cluster approach. If the demands this new advising system imposed on faculty members were substantially greater, then the team decided it was unrealistic to expect students to be able to meet them. Second, no funds were available to hire students selected for their advising talents, and no funds were available for training them to properly advise.

The team finally decided to limit the role of most student workers to giving directions, answering routine questions, and helping to make the new students feel comfortable. A few specially chosen students, all of whom had previously worked registration under the direction of the Registration Office Manager, would be assigned to packet pick-up, handing out class cards, and packet check.

Other than those specially chosen students, who were paid with separate funds, student workers were funded by work-study. The team sent out a memo to various wtudent services on campus asking for student help and used all students

whose names were turned in. The quality and dependability of the student help varied.

14. Training of Faculty Advisors. Throughout the entire planning phase of the project, the team intended to train the faculty advisors. However, the actual procedures and content of the training session were not determined until shortly before the date set for the training. A three hour block of time during the afternoon of the day on which registration would begin (July 30, 1979) was set aside for training. This limited time was a function of the funds available to pay the faculty for training, but the limited budget itself was a function of the naive view that training was a minor matter. The team did not consider the impact of training on the quality of advising. Further, the team attempted to build too much material into the three hour session. Overall, the training session ran overtime and advisor evaluations show it did not successfully inform advisors of their responsibilities and did not achieve the primary goal of preparing advisors for their new role. It is surprising that the registration went as well as it did, given the inadequate preparation of advisors.

15. Training of Student Workers. Two training sessions were used for the student workers, one in the afternoon and one in the early evening, on the Thursday before registration began. The students attended one or the other. Each session lasted about one and one-half hours, for which the students were paid out of work-study funds. Materials were given out informing the students of the various work stations nadthe responsibilities of each station, and the entire registration process was reviewed. The student turn-out for these training sessions was quite high, but the actual population of student workers during

registration was relatively low. The difficulty did not seem to lie with the duties assigned to students, nor with the pressures of the work assignments. Rather, there was a lack of cooperation between the various student activities groups which furnished the work-study students and the team. In retrospect, this was probably due to poor communications between the team and the various cooperating groups about the necessity of a coordinated effort at registration. Hence, some of the groups involved encouraged their work-study students to function in terms of their special interests rather than working with the registration process as a whole.

16. Summary of the New Process. A summary of the final process for the special advisement and registration in August, 1979 follows. The student progressed through the following steps:

1. Pick up packet in Science Building, according to time assigned.
2. Attend Orientation Session
3. Take CGP placement test if needed.
4. Fill in Student Assessment Sheet and Student Planning Sheet.
5. If needed, see Basic Studies Assessment advisor for individual interview.
6. Go to Student Union and see appropriate academic advisor. (If an Express student, by-pass advising.)
7. Fill in class schedule card, using information on screens.
8. Get all class cards at Card Pick-up Table.
9. Go to Packet Check.
10. Pay fees, etc.
11. Attend Student Activities Fair.

The entire process took between about 15 minutes (for students who skipped Orientation and used the Express table) and three hours (for students who went through all the steps listed). No student was forced to participate in orientation, testing, or advising, although all of these were strongly encouraged.

DIFFICULTIES WHICH AROSE FOR THE TEAM. During the summer, the team encountered three kinds of difficulties. There were problems with the relation of the team to the District administration, problems which arose on the campus level, and finally, the team faced a series of miscellaneous pressures and frustrations. Most of these difficulties were in themselves small, but the cumulative effect on the team was monumental. The team was able to continue its activities in the face of these various problems because of the open discussion and sense of unity it maintained. The major difficulties are described below.

1. Difficulties in the Relation to District Administration. Difficulties which arose in the spring, and continued into the summer, concerned deadlines for submission of the project proposal, District failure to meet its own deadlines, and isolation of the team from the District.

The project director and the Director of Research and Development worked against a March, 1979 deadline for submission of the proposal. The Director of Research and Development even hand delivered the final copy of the proposal to the District office in order to meet that deadline. However, in spite of the pressures to submit the proposal by the March deadline, it was July, 1979 before the team learned that it had been even partially funded by District, since the District committee which reviewed the proposal did not meet its own deadline for a decision. That deadline was, in fact, postponed several times without any explanation to the project director. The initial proposal was turned down in April, after the announced deadline, and no reasons or official notification wer given to the project director. When the team indirectly learned that a revised proposal would be considered by District, this was prepared and submitted, and again the District delayed making a decision. During

this period, and throughout the project, no direct contact about the proposal ever occurred between the project director and the District evaluators. The team, however, began its work on May 15, directly after the end of the spring semester. On July 10 the project director finally heard through a campus administrator that District had funded part of the project. Thus, the team worked without project funding for about two months, uncertain (except for verbal assurances by campus administration that the money would be found somehow) that team members would even be paid. The implication of this state of affairs was that the team might have designed a new advisement and registration system and then might not have been able to implement it, and that the team might not know if this would happen until after much of its work was done. There was no feasible way to delay the work while the team waited for a District decision. The outcome was team frustration.

Due to the uncertainty about District evaluation of the project, the team felt isolated from and ignored by the District. At times, there was discussion among team members about discontinuing the project. The team worked without contracts, putting in long hours each week and, inevitably, resentment arose. The lack of professional recognition by the District, combined with the total lack of communication from any District administrator, again produced frustration. Verbal assurances by the campus administration that the team would be paid eventually and that somehow the project would be completed only temporarily eased this frustration, because the practical problem of working without a contract remained. The implications for faculty participation in such projects is serious. Faculty members are generally unaware of administrative problems, particularly at the District level. Hence, legitimate but unexplained delays in District decisions are easily perceived as indifference, and faculty morale declines.

2. Difficulties Which Arose on the Campus Level. On the campus level, there were problems for the team in determining the proper campus channels for administrative support, the necessary limitations on team expenditures, the proper procedures for getting administrative decisions, and various difficulties of a "housekeeping" nature.

Throughout the summer, the team did not understand which administrators in the District were the responsible agents to whom the team should appeal for clarification of its status. The campus administration agreed to assume responsibility for three weeks pay (until July 1) while District personnel pondered whether to fund the project at all. When July 1 arrived, campus funds were used to pay the team for another three weeks. At no time did the team clearly understand the exact chain of command involved in the resolution of this issue, and no written communications were provided to clarify the situation. The implication was that the team did not know who could (or would) decide the legitimate status of the team. This doubt about whether the registration could actually occur remained until July 10 (when the team was finally notified verbally that District funding for the advisors at registration had been approved.)

Without definite approval of the project proposal, the team had to work in a vacuum of good will when making decisions about expenditures. Development of materials for the use of both advisors and registering students was affected because the team did not know what budget limitations on duplication of materials, paper, and other supplies would apply, or even to whom to charge these items. The implication of not having a firm budget was that the team constantly worried about being able to get the money needed to finance its project, and sometimes had to rely on informal offers of help from various campus personnel and donations of paper, stencils, etc. from various campus offices.

Decisions had to be made at various points during the summer, but the team never was sure about whom to see, or just what limitations on its authority existed. The project proposal indicated that the team would make recommendations and carry out activities consistent with those recommendations. In order to function, the team went ahead and prepared its recommendations without knowing exactly to whom it should report them, or what would happen should different administrators disagree. All members of the team were faculty members, and thus without any administrative authority. The project director was constantly faced with second-guessing what administrative decisions would be made in response to team recommendations, without knowing which administration - District or campus - was the actual decision-making body. Numerous minor "housekeeping" problems arose, and took on importance because the team had the impression that it was not recognized as a legitimate body. Several examples will illustrate this. Indirectly, the project director learned that the college president planned to shut off the refrigeration in the building the team used daily, and had neglected to even tell her. (A frank talk resolved this problem.) Secretarial help was never made available, although the campus administration was aware that extensive materials were being prepared. The best the project director could do about this was to hire a work-study student, who was not satisfactory in the quality of her work, and to rely on informal offers of help from campus staff. Less than a week before registration, the team learned that the college catalogs would not be available until after the special registration! To meet this crisis, the Dean of Instruction had enough xerox copies of the crucial parts of the catalog made for all advisors, but no current catalog information could be made available for registering students!

A major morale crisis occurred when the project director ordered paper to run off the thousands of copies of materials needed for students at registration, only to be told (late in July) that the District warehouse did not have the paper. The details of that particular situation are enlightening, and on hindsight, amusing. When the team found out the paper was not available, panic occurred. There were 22 different items to be duplicated, some intended only for advisors (100 copies each) but a number intended for all registering students (5100 each). The Dean of Instruction decided that the large runs should be done by a printer, and arranged for this. The printer promised delivery of all those materials by Wednesday, July 25, less than a week before registration, but in sufficient time to collate the materials. In the meantime, the smaller runs were done on a college mimeograph machine by campus work-study students loaned by the Chemistry Department on paper loaned from various campus offices. However, the printer did not meet his deadline. No materials arrived at all until Thursday, July 26, and then only a few. On Friday, July 27 the team began making frequent telephone calls to the printers; the frequency increased as the day wore on and became hourly by early evening! The campus closed down at noon that day and the refrigeration was turned off for the weekend, so the team brought in fans and settled in for a hot July afternoon and evening. The printer finally began delivering more materials in the afternoon, a little at a time. Although the team was kept busy preparing last minute items (such as name tags for advisors) and keeping each other's spirits up as the hours wore on, there was fear that the materials would not be completely delivered, and the printer did not work on the week-end. Finally, the last of the materials was delivered at a little before eight p.m. By them, shoes had come off, cokes had been brought in, and an attitude of "we shall overcome" prevailed.

3. Miscellaneous Pressures and Frustrations Faced by the Team. The team also faced several unanticipated problems of a miscellaneous nature. Hindsight offers some suggestions regarding how to avoid these. Major problems of this type are given below, with some of these suggestions.

The team was overworked and underpaid. Although paid (at a low summer rate) for only six weeks of work at 30 hours per week, the team worked long hours and for eleven weeks throughout the summer. This overwork was certainly not intended by the administration and was not expected by the team. Enthusiasm for the project and a spirit of professionalism served together to keep the team functioning effectively, but perhaps these very qualities helped to create the overwork problem. It would have been more realistic to have recognized the time limitations and the dimensions of the task, and to have budgeted both time and money accordingly.

The team became extremely fatigued. In large part, this was due to overwork, but the desire by all team members to make this experiment a success also contributed. A more realistic appraisal of the requirements of the project might have helped the team to set reasonable standards for its work.

There was a lack of cooperation by other groups on campus. This surprised the team, but hindsight suggests the team was naive in assuming such cooperation. The team did not adequately publicize its activities, nor did the administration explain to these other groups the nature of the team's work. Better communication, both about the intentions of the team in designing the new process and about the help needed from other campus groups, would have eased this problem.

The paperwork required by the budget (when it was finally approved) was time-consuming. No secretarial help was provided, although the project director had to keep detailed records of the work hours of both the student help and the faculty advisors during the two-week advisement and registration.

Daily records were necessary throughout the two weeks and were compiled late at night or early in the morning of each day. A solution to this problem would have been to have budgeted for adequate secretarial help.

The project director had to handle all clean-up matters. Not only did the materials for advising have to be set out each day during registration, but straightening up each night also had to be done. No help was available for this, and the project director and another member of the team did this work. After the registration was completed, the project director had to load up all materials and transport them to her office building for storage. This was a major physical endeavor, carried out under conditions of near physical exhaustion. However, better planning for use of student help would have alleviated this problem. Students could have been assigned to the daily tasks of clean-up and setting out materials, as well as the final clean-up operation.

4. Implication of the Team's Difficulties. An implication of the team's difficulties in all three of the above areas should be drawn. All members of the team were faculty members, without experience in administration, and without knowledge of procedures which would have reduced their difficulties. Faculty members cannot be expected to understand the mechanisms for clarifying communications with either the District or campus administrations, nor do they know the procedures for resolving such matters as dealing with printer's schedules, lack of supplies, and inadequate secretarial help. Much of the frustration and confusion over these matters could have been avoided if there had been an awareness on both the administration's and the team's parts of the need to spell out such procedures.

SUMMARY. Part II has described all aspects of the new advisement and registration process developed by the project team. Some parts of the process were

not adequately designed (testing, materials for advisors, training of advisors, etc.) and these shortcomings have been pointed out. Various procedural difficulties which the team encountered have also been illustrated.

PART III

MATERIALS DEVELOPED FOR FACULTY ADVISORS, STUDENT HELPERS, AND REGISTERING STUDENTS, AND THEIR USE

The team developed a variety of materials for the use of faculty advisors, student helpers, and registering students. Some of these materials were the result of careful discussion and evaluation over the summer, but the team became aware of the need for some quite late, and these reflect the hurried effort which produced them. Modifications of most of these materials were made for the January, 1980 registration, but further improvements are needed and should be made for the future. All materials and their intended use are briefly explained below. The discussion concerns three categories: materials for faculty advisors, materials for student workers, and materials for registering students. A discussion of the effectiveness of these materials is found in the following section of this report.

MATERIALS FOR FACULTY ADVISORS. All these materials were explained at a three-hour training session for faculty advisors which was held on the afternoon of the same day the advisement and registration for new students began. All faculty advisors and campus administrators attended. Each advisor was given a name tag to wear during registration; a folder containing an agenda for the training session, with materials prepared for advisors and copies of all materials to be given to registering students; and an evaluation form for the training session itself. (In addition, an evaluation form for the advising period was provided at the end of registration, which all the advisors completed.)

1. Agenda for Faculty Advisor Training Session. The agenda indicated the materials to be covered in the training session. After a welcome and introductions of all participants, some background information about Basic Studies,

the philosophy of the project, and the difference between the old and new processes were covered. Then all materials provided advisors were explained plus the mechanics of the new process, hints on interviewing registering students, and even provisions for food during the advising period. In addition, a 75-minute period was set aside for training the individual advising clusters.

2. Flow Charts of Old and New Registration Processes. The "old" (traditional) method of registration was detailed by a flow chart which was given to the faculty advisors and also was shown on a transparency during the training session. The intent was to emphasize the complexity and inefficiency of the "old" system. In contrast, the "new" simplified registration system was also shown in a flow chart.

3. Evaluation of Test Scores. A two page test score evaluation and placement guideline was provided. This showed the cutoff scored for placement in Basic Studies courses plus a description of each of these courses.

4. Error Corrections for Catalog and Class Schedule. This was a four page correction of information in the current catalog and class schedule. It included a correction of the interpretation of test scores, courses not included in the catalog and/or class schedule, brief descriptions of new or omitted courses (and in one case, an entire degree program), plus classes offered at an off-campus location (Maryvale High School).

5. The Three Degree Programs. Check sheets were given to the faculty advisors showing an accurate list of degree requirements for each of the three new degree programs available in the District. These check sheets were an update of information printed in the catalog and therefore more accurate, and thus

important for use in advisement. These same sheets were duplicated in sufficient numbers to give to all interested students.

6. Handouts Given to New Students. In addition to the three degree check sheets, all other materials given to new students were put into the advisors' folders and were briefly explained to the advisors. These will be described below.

7. Advisor Assignments and Cafeteria Layout. A list of the academic subject areas assigned to each advising cluster and a "map" of the physical setup of the advising/registration layout in the cafeteria were given to each faculty advisor and explained in the training session. The intent was to inform all advisors of both the appropriate location for advisement in a particular subject matter, and to show where in the physical setup of the registration process each aspect of the registration occurred.

8. Advisor Responsibilities. A two page list of advisor responsibilities was provided and briefly reviewed during the training session. This list included specific preparation for advising (be familiar with the catalog, degree requirements, transferable courses, and test scores, etc.), general suggestions for advising students, suggestions for helping a student create a schedule, and some specific precautions to guide advisors.

9. Basic Studies Assessment Sheet. A special Basic Studies Assessment Sheet was run off on goldenrod paper (for easy identification at registration) to be used for assessment of those who fell below the minimal cutoff scores for remedial English ans/or reading courses. This was intended for use in individual assessment before the student reached the advisement and registration area in

the cafeteria. The form was explained to all faculty advisors, and those in the Basic Studies sub-group were further trained in the use of this instrument.

10. Prefix Code List. A list of all course prefix codes used in the District, correlated with the subject and with the department offering that subject, was provided to advisors.

11. Schedule of Advisors. As a convenience to the advisors, a list of working schedules of all advisors was provided, both by time (those advisors at each advising table at any given time) and by individual (a listing of all advisors in alphabetical order).

12. Material Provided "Table C" (Humanities, Social Science, and General.) Three pieces of information were provided advisors in this advising cluster, and were explained during the sub-group part of the training session. (a) A "quickie" sheet. This was a list of courses which would definitely transfer to state universities. (b) "Suggestions for Students Who Have Moderate Reading Difficulties." This was a two page list of courses that the team suggested would be appropriate for students placed in Basic Studies courses. (c) Information about Pre-Law Courses. A sheet of general information was developed to aid in advising pre-law students.

13. Information About Occupational Programs. The Associate Dean of Instruction for Occupational Education developed background information about programs, courses, prerequisites, critical sequences of courses, etc. for all the occupational programs offered by the college. This information was given to the advisors for the Science and Technology cluster, and was reviewed with them in their sub-group training.

14. Information About Programs in Science and Mathematics. Background information about various programs in the natural sciences and about mathematics courses was also given to the Science and Technology cluster, providing a variety of information about these programs, as well as an explanation of requirements for placement in math courses.

15. Xerox Copy of Catalog. Because the new catalogs would not be available until after the special advisement and registration, each advisor was given a xerox copy of the programs and courses sections of the new catalog.

16. Evaluation Forms. Two evaluation forms were given to the advisors: an evaluation of the training session and an evaluation of the registration process. Many of the advisors did not complete the evaluation of training, particularly the Basic Studies advisors. This was probably due to the hurried state of affairs at the end of the training session when the forms were distributed. However, all of the advisors completed the evaluation of the advisement and registration process on the last day of registration. Results will be discussed in the next section.

MATERIALS FOR STUDENT WORKERS. The student workers were trained in two sessions on the Thursday before registration began. One session was in the afternoon and one in the evening, and all student workers attended one or the other. An overview of the new process was given at each training session, using some of the same transparencies that were used in the faculty advisor training. In addition, a six page handout was given to each student worker. This handout consisted of the following:

1. Cover sheet. This included a list of that individual student's work days, work times, and work station. It also included a brief summary of what to do on each day (report in, sign time card, pick up name tag, etc.) and emergency phone numbers to call should the student not be able to report in.

2. Student Stations, Activities, and Supervisors. A list of all student stations was given to the student workers. The station, its location, the activity to be performed there, and the supervisor for that station were all listed.

3. Responsibilities of Student Assistants. This material listed each student station and correlated it with the responsibilities assigned to the student at that station. The responsibilities were listed in outline form for easy reference.

4. Evaluation of Training Session. At the end of each of the student worker training sessions, all students completed an evaluation of the training session. The results are discussed in the next section.

MATERIALS FOR REGISTERING STUDENTS. The team spent considerable time during the summer developing materials that would benefit new students. Two criteria were applied: that the materials should be clear and friendly, and that they should make it easier for new students to understand both the registration process and the services of the college.

1. Acceptance Letter. The team cooperated with the Associate Dean, Student Personnel Services to develop a letter that was informative and friendly. Since Glendale is an open door institution, the letter really functioned as

a "welcome" letter rather than an acceptance letter. With this in mind, a Spanish version of the letter was also prepared and sent to students who indicated on their applications that Spanish was their primary language.

2. Notice for the Handicapped. The Special Services division of the Counseling Department prepared a form which was sent to all students who identified themselves on their applications as handicapped. This letter explained that assistance would be available to all handicapped students who returned the form indicating when they would be registering and where they would like a student helper to meet them upon their arrival for registration.

3. Self Assessment Scale (SAS). The team developed a four page self assessment scale (SAS) for new students, based on several scales used at other colleges. There were three divisions to the scale: preferences (what I like), skills (what I do), and taking stock (goals and personal resources).

4. Student Planning Sheet (SPS). The team developed a two page Student Planning Sheet (SPS) which encouraged the student to indicate his/her education/vocation goals, tentative plan for the school week in hours per activity, tentative academic schedule, approximate time requirements to meet the academic schedule of courses, and a list of alternative choices should first-choice courses be closed. Some of the SPS could be filled in by the student before seeing an advisor, but parts would require an advisor's help. The intent was to provide a tool for both student and advisor to meet the student's immediate academic needs. It was also hoped that it would ease the registration process for the student by listing alternative choices geared to the student's program which would meet specific academic needs

should the first choices of courses be closed.

5. Student Flow Chart and Vocabulary for Survival. These were printed back to back on one sheet of paper. The Student Flow Chart was a simplified three-step graphic flow of the major aspects of registration (packet pick-up, assessment and testing, and advisement and registration). The Vocabulary for Survival listed common academic terms (jargon) which students might not know, such as "drop/add", "electives", and "official absence".

6. Activities Flyer. This was developed by a member of the team and briefly explained the various activities available to students on the campus.

7. Check Sheets for the Three Degrees. The District had just adopted three different degrees, rather than the one Associate in Arts degree previously awarded. These were a transfer degree (AA), a general studies degree (AGS), and a career specified degree (AAS). Check sheets for each degree were developed, updating the college catalog. The intent was to provide students with accurate information about the requirements for each degree.

8. "Help Us" Questionnaire. All registering new students were invited to complete this questionnaire about the new advisement/registration process. All aspects of the process were covered.

9. Name Tags. Through the courtesy of a local bank, all new students received name tags. The intended benefit was that all GCC personnel could call each student by name, thus personalizing the process.

10. Class Schedules and Catalogs. Class schedules for the current semester

were available to students, but college catalogs were not, due to a printing delay. Some old catalogs were made available, for general reference.

SUMMARY OF MATERIALS. A variety of materials was prepared for faculty advisors, student workers, and registering students. The materials for faculty advisors were both for training and for use during the advising process. For training of advisors an agenda, flow charts of both the old and new registration processes, copies of handouts to be given to registering students, a list of advisor assignments, a "map" of the physical layout for registration, a list of advisor responsibilities, and all materials for use during advising were provided. For use during advising, each advisor received a test score evaluation sheet; a list of corrections in the catalog and class schedule; copies of the check sheets for the three degree programs; a Basic Studies assessment sheet; a prefix code list; a schedule of all advisors; information about transfer courses, courses appropriate for students with reading difficulties, occupational programs, and science programs and mathematics courses; a xerox copy of the catalog information on programs and courses; and evaluation forms for both the training session and the advisement and registration process.

Student workers received a six page set of instructions which consisted of a cover sheet indicating work assignment and procedures, a list of student stations and activities, an outline of student worker responsibilities, and an evaluation form for the training session.

The registering students received an acceptance letter, a notice for handicapped students, the SAS and SPS, a flow chart of the registration process, a list of academic vocabulary, an activities flyer, and the "Help Us" questionnaire. A few were given an appropriate degree check sheet.

Evaluation of these materials, and a discussion of their later use, is part of the next section.

PART IV

EVALUATION OF THE ADVISEMENT AND REGISTRATION PROCESS

There are three ways in which the special advisement and registration for new students may be evaluated. One is to examine the evaluations completed by faculty advisors, administrators, student workers, and the new students themselves. A second is to examine and evaluate the retention data available from the computer. Third, the project director can provide an evaluation from the team perspective. All three types of evaluations follow.

EVALUATIONS BY FACULTY ADVISORS, ADMINISTRATORS, STUDENT WORKERS, AND REGISTERING STUDENTS. All faculty advisors were asked to complete an evaluation of the training session, and also to complete an evaluation of the registration process. Administrators completed an open-ended questionnaire after registration was finished. Student workers were asked to complete an evaluation of their training session. All registering students were asked to complete the "Help Us" questionnaire immediately after completing the registration process. All of these are analyzed below.

1. Evaluations of Advisor Training Session. A one page questionnaire was distributed to each advisor training sub-group. Twenty two were returned. The questionnaire asked for ratings on seven questions about the training session, on a scale from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree. Mean ratings for the seven questions were:

4.47 Understood the main goals for this new advisement & registration process

4.36 Understood the purpose of the training session

4.13 The introductions were appropriate

4.00 Understood the early registration process

3.81 The advisor was comfortable

3.78 Received useful training in the sub-group

3.00 Training on how to interview a student was useful

As these results suggest, faculty advisors felt they understood the purpose of the new process and of the training session, but were somewhat uneasy with the specialized but brief training for their particular advising clusters, and even more uneasy about suggestions for working with students.

The advisors were also asked to rate both the explanations and written materials they received for usefulness to an advisor. Eleven items were listed, plus an "overall" item. At least two thirds of the advisors ranked the material showing the cafeteria physical layout and list of advising tables, and the list of advisors' names and assignments as 4 (agree) or 5 (strongly agree), indicating they found them useful. At least two thirds also ranked the following written material "agree" or "strongly agree" in terms of usefulness: the test score sheet, advisor instructions, materials for students, and the "overall" written materials.

The questionnaire results indicated that the flow charts of the old and new processes were not particularly effective, the error corrections information was probably not perceived as useful by many advisors, the check sheets for the three degrees had limited impact, and the prefix code list was not effective.

After observing the actual advising process during the two week period, the project director concluded that the value of some of these materials was not effectively communicated to the advisors. Part of the questionnaire completed by advisors after the special registration asked about use of materials, and the results generally confirm these observations. The mean ratings for use of materials during the registration process follow. (1 = did not use; 2 = used some; 3 = used a great deal):

2.92 test score sheet

2.53 checksheets for the three degrees

2.21 materials provided "Table C", about occupational programs, and about programs and courses in science and math

1.96 advisor instruction sheet

1.92 courses for moderate readers

1.85 correction sheet

1.75 list of advisors and advisor assignments

1.60 "quickie" check sheet (for Table C)

1.39 prefix code sheet

The most used written material was the test score sheet. The check sheets for the three degrees updated the information in the class schedule and in the catalog, and therefore were important, but in spite of the mean ratings above, the advisors often seemed to prefer to use the traditional printed information: few of the check sheets were given to students. Some materials given to the advisor sub-groups were used more than others. The "quickie" sheet for Table C was not effective, and was not used for the January, 1980 registration, although the Handbook for Advisors developed during Fall, 1979 does include similar types of information. (The Handbook is discussed in Part V of this report.) Similarly, pre-law information was expanded into a Pre-Law program for inclusion in the Handbook. In spite of the fact that at least two thirds of the advisors thought the schedule of advisors and their assignments useful at the training session, the evaluations completed after the advisement period indicated they did not use this information during the actual process, and this sort of information was not provided for the January, 1980 registration.

Two types of written material seemed particularly popular with the advisors, and both became the basis for the "Program" section of the Advisor Handbook. These were the information about occupational programs and about

programs in science and mathematics.

Written comments on the training evaluation forms indicate that the advisors felt that the session was too rushed for the amount of information to be covered. The team shared this feeling. Overall, the training session covered too much material for the time available, and it ran late - which created a crisis in preparing for the beginning of registration that same afternoon. In fact, the session finished only briefly before the advisors began to advise! The project director concluded that there were specific weaknesses in the training session, as follows. (1) Although research indicates that a welcome and introductions are useful because they set the faculty members at ease, the faculty evaluations indicate that the advisors were eager to get into the training itself, and that time spent on this was not effectively used. Perhaps this approach would be effective in a longer training session.. (2) Comparison of the "old" and "new" processes for registration was not effective. This comparison involved the use of flow charts intended to illustrate the improved value of the "new" system. It may be that the differences between the two systems were not initially grasped by the advisors. (3) "Helpful hints on interviewing" were not effectively presented because by that point in the training program time was at a crucial premium, and the team was not able to take the time to explain what it had prepared. In retrospect, this seems a significant failure, because of the importance of sensitizing advisors to the importance of understanding the needs of the students. (4) The time available for training the sub-group clusters of advisors was extremely limited due to poor time allotment earlier in the training session. By the time the various sub-groups met for their specialized training, the pressure of the oncoming registration inhibited the effectiveness of the training period.

2. Evaluations of Student Worker Training Sessions. Fifty six students attended the student worker training sessions and completed an evaluation form. Overall, the responses were highly favorable, with virtually all questions rated high (agree or strongly agree). Comments indicated they favored the new process and found it interesting. However, many of these students did not return to actually participate in the process, and it seems wise not to place much emphasis on the responses given.

3. Evaluations of Advisement and Registration by Faculty Advisors. All thirty faculty advisors completed a questionnaire after the advisement and registration process was completed. Overall, the responses were quite favorable. Mean ratings for the fifteen questions about the registration process were as follows (the scale is from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree.):

4.85 The student assistants were useful

4.66 As an advisor, I was treated with respect

4.56 It was useful to have the screens near the advising tables

4.50 The registering students were treated with consideration

4.36 I had time to deal with individual students

4.34 The card pick-up area was successful

4.23 Overall, the registration flow was effective

4.13 I liked the discipline groupings (advising clusters)

4.13 The Student Fair was a positive addition to the process

4.00 If I couldn't answer a question, I was able to find someone who could

3.95 The Express table was a good idea

3.73 The Basic Studies Assessment sheet was useful (answered only by Basic Studies advisors)

3.44 The students came to me prepared to be advised

3.21 The Student Planning Sheet (SPS) was useful

2.88 Some students shared their self assessment (SAS) with me

The mean ratings for use of materials during the registration process have

already been discussed above.

Twenty five or more of the advisors rated the following either 4 (agree) or 5 (strongly agree): the registering students were treated with consideration; the registration flow was effective; they, as advisors, were treated with respect; it was useful to have screens listing open and closed sections placed near the advising tables; and they had time to deal with individual students. Of the thirty advisors, twenty two indicated they would voluntarily serve as permanent faculty advisors in the future. The written comments offered constructive criticism and, on the whole, they were quite supportive of the new process.

4. Evaluations by Administrators and Others. Sixteen administrators, team members, and selected other personnel on campus completed an open-ended evaluation form. The responses were highly supportive of the new process. All of them thought the "theme" used for the special registration ("G.C.C. - The Right Place to Be") was appropriate, and almost all thought it was demonstrated consistently throughout the advisement process. Overall, they thought the registering students were treated with consideration. They thought there were a number of positive aspects to the process: the heavy emphasis on advising, the elimination of lines for the students, the separation into registration areas, the slower pace, the card pick-up procedure, and the informality and overall attitudes expressed. They noted some problems with orientation, insufficient training of advisors, inadequate signs designating advising areas, some problems with the flow of students, and the lack of cooperation by some campus groups. They were tolerant of the training session for advisors, but did indicate that it covered too much in too short a time. Generally, they indicated that their expectations of the new process had been more than met, although they realized that the retention data would have to be available to show monetary success.

5. Evaluations by Registering Students. All students who registered in the special registration were asked to complete a "Help Us" questionnaire, and 351 questionnaires were returned. The rating scale for the first 15 questions ranged from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree. The range of mean ratings was 3.425 to 4.377. The responses indicate strong approval (over 4.0) of the packet pick-up procedures, the help provided during registration, the organization of the entire process, and the contents of the acceptance letter. The least appreciated (under 3.5 but over 3.4) were testing as part of the registration process and the self-assessment instrument. Overall, the responses can be interpreted as favorable. Three open-ended questions were also asked about the longest wait experienced, the most valuable time spent, and the least valuable time spent. The physical layout of the new process was designed for maximum student convenience and, although only a small number of students (135 maximum) completed the open-ended questions, 32.6% (44) indicated they had no wait at all! 25% (34) indicated the longest wait was at Orientation. Of those who responded about the most valuable time spent, 66.4% (80 out of 134 responses) indicated advising/counseling was most valuable. Of those who responded about the least valuable time spent, 35% (36 out of 104 responses) indicated Orientation was least valuable. This is consistent with the delay experienced at Orientation, and with the comments of former students who felt they did not need to attend that activity. Perhaps the most informative results of the questionnaire are the comments written by the students. These indicate some weak areas in the process (e.g., Orientation and Testing) and these were improved in the January, 1980 registration. Overall, most of the comments show appreciation for the new process.

Some of the materials that were given students were not evaluated as effective by the team and the committee which replaced it, and were not used in the January, 1980 advisement and registration. The Spanish version of the acceptance letter was not widely distributed, and was not used for January, 1980,

although a Spanish paragraph was retained. The response to the notice for the handicapped was very low, and this form was not used in January. On the other hand, although student and advisor responses indicated the SAS was not very effective (probably because advisors did not usually ask about it), it was retained for the January, 1980 registration. However, a modification was introduced: it was mailed out with the acceptance letter in the hope that new students would find it of more value if they had it ahead of time. Similarly, although advisor evaluations indicated that only some advisors used the SPS, it was used again in January, 1980 because the committee believed that it would prove widely beneficial to students. The student flow chart did not prove effective, and a more precise and less imaginative chart was substituted in January. But, the Vocabulary for Survival was retained, with some minor changes, and was incorporated into the Schedule of Classes for Spring, 1980. The Activities flyer was also used again in January. Name tags for students were not used in January, primarily due to a lack of advance planning.

EVALUATION OF RETENTION RATES FOR NEW STUDENTS IN THE FALL, 1979 SEMESTER. Retention data for new students who participated in the August, 1979 special registration are available for both 45th day[1] and end-of-the-semester, as well as data showing their credit hours completed compared to credit hours attempted. The data analyzed here are presented in Tables I through VI which follow. A total of 7312 new students registered for the Fall, 1979 semester (in either the special or the regular registration periods.) Of these, 4515 participated in the new registration process, and 2797 did not. Of the 4515 participating in the new process, three separate groups can be identified: those who were advised, those evaluated for placement in Basic Studies courses, and those who

---

[1]State funding for community college students is based on FTSE (Full-Time Student Equivalency) as of the 45th day of the semester.

elected to forego advising. The students in the three groups may be considered homogenous because they applied early enough to participate, in contrast with the fourth group (Other New Students) who applied after the special registration was completed.

1. Characteristics of New Students Who Participated in the Special Registration.

Advised Students. Of the 4515 students who participated in the new process, slightly over a third (1677 or 37.2%) were in this category. Of these, about half were part-time (50.9%) and half full-time (49.1%). Two-thirds (64.1%) were Day students, one-third (35.9%) Evening students. These students were advised by trained advisors who worked in one of three program clusters: Business, Science/Technology, and Humanities/Social Science. An advisor helped a student with any program assigned to that cluster.

Basic Studies Students. Of the 4515 students who participated in the new process, 18% (811) were in this group. Two-thirds (65.8%) were full-time students, and one-third (34.2%) part-time. A high percentage (78.4%) were Day students, compared to only 11.1% Evening students. These students were identified through testing as needing remedial work in English and reading, and they were sent to special advisors for correct placement in those courses. Most of these students also received help in choosing correct programs and courses to complete their schedules at one of the regular advising tables.

Express Students. Of the 4515 students who participated in the new process, 44.8% (2027) chose not to see an advisor at all. A high percentage (86.3%) were part-time students, and two-thirds (66%) were Evening students. Only 13.6% were full-time, and 34.0% Day students. Although not advised, these students did participate in the other aspects of the new process.

Other New Students. There were 2797 new students who registered during the regular registration in late August or during "Late Registration". These

students did not participate in the new process at all. 84.6% of these students were part-time and 65.0% of them were Evening students. Only 15.4% were full-time students, and 35.0% Day students.

Composite Groups. The new students can also be grouped into advised and non-advised categories for comparison. The advised category includes both the "Advised" and the "Basic Studies" groups identified above, and is Group 5 in the Tables. The non-advised category includes the "Express" and "Other New Students" groups identified above, and is Group 6 in the Tables.

Summary Table of New Student Characteristics: Fall, 1979 Registrations

Category	# in Category	% of Students Participating in New Process	% of Cat. Who Were Part-Time	% of Cat. Who Were Full-Time	% of Cat. Who Were Day Stud.	% of Cat. Who Were Eve. Stud.
Advised	1677	37.2	50.9	49.1	64.1	35.9
Basic Studies	811	18.0	34.2	65.8	78.4	11.1
Express	2027	44.8	86.3	13.6	34.0	66.0
Other New	2797	——	84.6	15.4	35.0	65.0

2. Analysis of Retention Data. Overall, students who were affected by the major innovations in the advising process (the advising clusters and the special advising and placement for "Basic Studies" students) show better retention rates than the students who chose not to receive this assistance ("Express" and "Other New Students"). This is shown for every measure of retention illustrated in the following Tables, both for total withdrawals and for completion of attempted credit hours.

It should be noted that in Fall, 1979 the end-of-semester attrition rate at G.C.C. was 16.6%. Similar attrition rates for Fall, 1979 occured at comparable

District colleges; Mesa (14.8%), Phoenix College (17.1%). In the entire 6 college District the attrition was 16.2%. A comparison of completion rates (percent of attempted courses completed) for Glendale, Mesa, and Phoenix College shows Glendale had the highest completion rate (69%), Mesa was second (66%), Phoenix College third (64%). There was an overall completion rate for the District of 67%.

Data on Complete Withdrawals. Table I shows that "Advised" students had the lowest rate for complete withdrawals by the 45th day (5.7%) with "Basic Studies" students second lowest (6.2%). When the data are broken down for Day versus Evening students (Table II), Day students who were advised tended to remain until the 45th day (4.4% withdrawals) more than advised Evening students (8.1%), but both groups had lower withdrawal rates than either the "Express" or "Other New Students" categories. Although there is a lower withdrawal rate for Day "Express" students (6.5%) than for Evening "Express" students (10.4%), both of these groups had more withdrawals than comparable "Advised" and "Basic Studies" students.

Tables I and II also indicate that the withdrawal rates by the end of the semester (EOS) show a consistent pattern for the four groups: "Basic Studies" students showed lowest attrition (11.7% overall, 10.5% Day, 16.0% Evening); "Advised" students were second lowest in withdrawals (14.1% overall, 11.4% Day, 18.8% Evening); "Express" students were third lowest (20.4% overall, 16.4% Day, 22.5% Evening); and the "Other New Students" had the highest withdrawals (23.1% overall, 19.2% Day, 25.3% Evening). When the two composite groups are examined, the difference is even more striking: Group 5 ("Advised" and "Basic Studies" students) had total withdrawals of 13.3% overall, 11.1% Day, and 18.2% Evening, compared to withdrawal rates for Group 6 ("Express" and "Other New Students") of 22.02% overall, 18.0% Day, and 24.1% Evening. The consistent ranking of the four groups suggests there may be a tendency for those students who received help in the new process to remain in school and complete their work. Students

who did not participate in even the physical changes of the new process ("Other New Students") showed the highest tendency to drop out. The somewhat lower withdrawal rate of the "Express" students, compared with the "Other New Students", may indicate that the emphasis on comfort and convenience in the new process created an attitude in the students beneficial to retention, but one cannot rule out (or measure) the possibility of higher motivation.

In summary, the withdrawal data indicate that "Advised" and "Basic Studies" students together had a substantially lower withdrawal rate than the combined group of "Express" and "Other New Students": 13.3% versus 22.0%. This difference holds up when comparing just Day students and when comparing just Evening students in the two composite groups.

Data on Completion of Attempted Courses. Another way of comparing the groups is to examine the data for completion of attempted courses. Overall, the "Advised" and "Basic Studies" students again show better retention rates than the "Express" and "Other New Students". Tables III and IV show that the "Advised" group completed almost 70% of attempted credit hours, with "Advised" Day students doing even better (over 71%), although "Advised" Evening students showed a lower completion rate (65.5%). "Basic Studies" students showed a similar overall and Day pattern, but dropped noticeably in the Evening student completion rate (down to about 60%). "Express" students again ranked third with an overall completion rate of 65%, with Day student completion slightly better and Evening student completion above that for "Basic Studies" students. The "Other New Students" had the lowest completion rates overall (less than 60%), for Day students (60.5%), and dropped below even the "Basic Studies" students at night (less than 59%). Data for the composite Groups 5 and 6 support the higher completion rate for "Advised" and "Basic Studies" students together.

When the groups are compared according to a breakdown for full-time and part-time students (Table V), there is one exception to the overall trend. Part-time "Express" students had the highest completion rate (62.9%), slightly better than part-time "Advised" students (62.6%). There was, however, a noticeable reversal for full-time students. Here "Advised" students (73.2%) and "Basic Studies" students (72.3%) clearly had a higher completion rate than either "Express" (69.7%) or "Other New Students" (62.5%). The completion rates of the two composite Groups 5 and 6 also indicate a substantial difference between full-time students who were advised or who received Basic Studies placement (72.8%) and students who did not receive such guidance (65.3%).

Data on Grade Point Average. A final measure of the four groups is Average G.P.A. (Table VI). "Express" students had the highest G.P.A. (2.805) overall, and if they were also part-time, this remained true. "Advised" students were second highest overall (2.727), and actually did better than the other three categories if they were also full-time students. "Basic Studies" students did less well than the other three categories no matter whether they were full-time or part-time, but this might be expected, considering that they were already identified as students needing remedial work. It should be noted, however, that the G.P.A. for "Basic Studies" students does not reflect the work of any students graded on a credit/no credit (P/Z) basis, which includes students enrolled in EN 059, EN 010, EN 015, EN 019, and EN 029 as well as related RE (reading) courses. Thus, the reported G.P.A. for these students may be distorted. The relatively low G.P.A. for the "Other New Students" taking 9-11 hours (2.584) or 12 hours or more (2.418) suggests that if they had been able to participate in the new process their final grades might have benefited. It should be remembered that all of these "Other New Students" who went through the regular registration in late August had the opportunity for traditional advising, and that there is no way to know what percentage took advantage of it.

However, the advising system available to them was not the cluster type used in the special registration, nor was the Basic Studies assessment method available.

Trends Suggested by the Data. The data shown in Tables I through VI suggest that there may be certain trends developing in the new registration process, and if there are they should appear when the January, 1980 registration data are analyzed. In January, all new students went through a process similar to the July 30 - August 10 registration, except for late registrants. One would expect to see retention rates (both for total withdrawal and for hours completed) similar to those shown here for "Advised", "Basic Studies", and "Express" students. The higher attrition rates for "Other New Students" should not be repeated, except for late registrants.

3. Summary of Data Presented in Tables. For complete withdrawals, Composite Group 5 (the "Advised" and "Basic Studies" students) had lower attrition rates than Composite Group 6 (the "Express" and "Other New Students") by the 45th day and at the end of the semester. This was true both for Day and for Evening students. The "Advised" students had lower attrition rates than "Basic Studies" students at the 45th day (except for Evening students), but by the end of the semester the "Basic Studies" students, both Day and Evening, were lower in attrition. "Express" students had a lower attrition rate than "Other New Students" both at the 45th day and the end of the semester, except for Evening students at the 45th day (the attrition rate for the two groups was identical in that case). Group 5 ("Advised" and "Basic Studies") completed more of their attempted credit hours than Group 6 ("Express" and "Other New Students"), except for the part-time students. In this case, the "Express" students had the highest completion rate, "Advised" second, and "Basic Studies" third. "Advised" full-time students completed more of their attempted hours than

any other group. On all measures, "Other New Students" completed less of their attempted credit hours than the other three groups. Part-time "Express" students had the highest average G.P.A., with "Advised" students second highest, "Other New Students" third, and "Basic Studies" students lowest. However, for full-time students, "Advised" students had a higher average G.P.A. than "Express", and "Other New Students" had the lowest.

4. Tables Showing Retention Data for Fall, 1979 Semester. The following six tables show the data on which the above analysis is based. The source is the Maricopa County Community College District Office.

TABLE I

COMPARISON OF COMPLETE WITHDRAWALS BY NEW STUDENTS DURING FALL SEMESTER, 1979

Category	Enrollment High Point	Enrolled on 45 Day	45 Day Attrition	45 Day Attrition %	Enrolled EOS	EOS Attrition	EOS Attrition %
1. Advised	1677	1581	96	5.7	1441	236	14.1
2. Basic Studies	811	761	50	6.2	716	95	11.7
3. Express	2027	1843	184	9.1	1613	414	20.4
4. Other New Students	2797	2533	264	9.4	2150	647	23.1
5. Group 1 & 2	2488	2342	146	5.9	2157	331	13.3
6. Group 3 & 4	4824	4376	448	9.3	3763	1061	22.0
All New Students	7312	6718	594	8.1	5920	1392	19.0

TABLE II

COMPARISON OF COMPLETE WITHDRAWALS BY NEW DAY STUDENTS WITH NEW EVENING STUDENTS FOR FALL SEMESTER, 1979

Category	Enrollment High Point	Enrolled On 45 Day	45 Day Attrition	45 Day Attrition %	Enrolled EOS	EOS Attrition	EOS Attrition %
DAY STUDENTS							
1. Advised	1075	1028	47	4.4	952	123	11.4
2. Basic Studies	636	598	38	6.0	569	67	10.5
3. Express	689	644	45	6.5	576	113	16.4
4. Other New Students	985	910	75	7.6	796	189	19.2
5. Group 1 & 2	1711	1626	85	5.0	1521	190	11.1
6. Group 3 & 4	1674	1554	120	7.2	1372	302	18.0
All New Day Students	3385	3180	205	6.1	2983	492	14.5
EVENING STUDENTS							
1. Advised	602	553	49	8.1	489	113	18.8
2. Basic Studies	175	163	12	6.9	147	28	16.0
3. Express	1338	1199	139	10.4	1037	301	22.5
4. Other New Students	1812	1623	189	10.4	1354	458	25.3
5. Group 1 & 2	777	716	61	7.9	636	141	18.2
6. Group 3 & 4	3150	2822	328	10.4	2391	759	24.1
All New Evening Students	3927	3538	389	9.9	3027	900	22.9
All New Day And Evening Students	7312	6718	594	8.1	5920	1392	19.0

TABLE III

COMPARISON OF CREDIT HOURS COMPLETED BY NEW STUDENTS DURING FALL SEMESTER, 1979

Category	Number of Students	Hours Attempted	Average Hours Attempted Per Student	Hours Completed	Average Hours Completed Per Student	% of Attempted Hours Completed
1. Advised	1676	17417	10.4	12182	7.3	69.9
2. Basic Studies	810	9350	11.8	6633	8.2	69.6
3. Express	2021	12630	6.2	8211	4.1	65.0
4. Other New Students	2786	16502	5.9	9842	3.5	59.6
5. Group 1 & 2	2486	26947	10.8	18815	7.6	69.8
6. Group 3 & 4	4807	29132	6.0	18053	3.8	62.0
All New Students	7293	56079	7.7	36868	5.1	65.7

- 68 -

TABLE IV

COMPARISON OF CREDIT HOURS COMPLETED BY NEW DAY STUDENTS WITH NEW EVENING STUDENTS FOR FALL SEMESTER, 1979

Category	Number of Students	Hours Attempted	Average Hours Attempted Per Student	Hours Completed	Average Hours Completed Per Student	% of Attempted Hours Completed
DAY STUDENTS						
1. Advised	1075	13594	12.6	9678	9.0	71.2
2. Basic Studies	635	8287	13.1	5889	9.3	71.1
3. Express	687	6181	9.0	4102	6.0	66.4
4. Other New Students	975	8773	9.0	5306	5.4	60.5
5. Group 1 & 2	1710	21881	12.8	15567	9.1	71.1
6. Group 3 & 4	1662	14954	9.0	9408	5.7	62.9
All New Day Students	3372	36835	10.9	24975	7.4	67.8
EVENING STUDENTS						
1. Advised	601	3823	6.4	2504	4.2	65.5
2. Basic Studies	175	1243	7.1	744	4.3	59.9
3. Express	1334	6449	4.8	4109	3.1	63.7
4. Other New Students	1811	7729	4.3	4535	2.5	58.7
5. Group 1 & 2	776	5066	6.5	3248	4.2	64.1
6. Group 3 & 4	3145	14178	4.5	8644	2.8	61.0
All New Evening Students	3921	19244	4.9	11892	3.0	61.8
All New Day and Evening Students	7293	56079	7.7	36868	5.1	65.7

TABLE V

COMPARISON OF CREDIT HOURS COMPLETED BY PART-TIME NEW STUDENTS WITH FULL-TIME NEW STUDENTS FOR FALL SEMESTER, 1979

Category	Number of Students	Hours Attempted	Average Hours Attempted Per Student	Hours Completed	Average Hours Completed Per Student	% of Attempted Hours Completed
PART-TIME						
1. Advised	853	5272	6.2	3298	3.9	62.6
2. Basic Studies	277	1875	6.7	1096	4.0	58.5
3. Express	1745	8721	5.0	5486	3.1	62.9
4. Other New Students	2357	10429	4.4	6043	2.6	57.9
5. Group 1 & 2	1130	7147	6.3	4394	3.9	61.5
6. Group 3 & 4	4102	19150	4.7	11529	2.8	60.2
All New Part-Time Students	5232	26297	5.0	15923	3.0	60.6
FULL-TIME						
1. Advised	823	12144	14.8	8884	10.8	73.2
2. Basic Studies	533	7655	14.4	5537	10.4	72.3
3. Express	276	3909	14.2	2724	9.9	69.7
4. Other New Students	429	6073	14.2	3798	8.9	62.5
5. Group 1 & 2	1356	19799	14.6	14421	10.6	72.8
6. Group 3 & 4	705	9982	14.2	6522	9.3	65.3
All New Full-Time Students	2061	29781	14.5	20943	10.2	70.3
All New Part-Time and Full-Time Students	7293	56079	7.7	36868	5.1	65.7

TABLE VI

COMPARISON OF AVERAGE G.P.A. OF NEW STUDENTS (N=7293) IN FALL SEMESTER, 1979

	1-8 Credit Hours			9-11 Credit Hours			12 or more Credit Hours			Totals for Each Category		
Category	# of Stud In Cat	% of All Stud In Cat	Avg GPA	# Stud In Cat	% of All Stud In Cat	Avg GPA	# Stud In Cat	% of All Stud In Cat	Avg GPA	Total # of Stud In Cat	% of All New Stud	Avg GPA For Cat
1. Advised	649	38.7	2.939	204	12.2	2.658	823	49.1	2.687	1676	23.0	2.727
2. Basic Studies	175	21.6	2.721	102	12.6	2.507	533	65.8	2.419	810	11.1	2.449
3. Express	1546	76.5	2.980	199	9.8	2.800	276	13.7	2.527	2021	27.7	2.805
4. Other New Students	2145	77.0	2.900	212	7.6	2.584	429	15.4	2.418	2786	38.2	2.684
5. Group 1 & 2	824	33.1	2.894	306	12.3	2.611	1356	54.6	2.584	2486	34.1	2.629
6. Group 3 & 4	3691	76.8	2.938	411	8.5	2.693	705	14.7	2.464	4807	65.9	2.628
All New Students	4515	61.9	2.928	717	9.8	2.655	2061	28.3	2.551	7293	100.0	2.685

EVALUATION BY PROJECT DIRECTOR. The project team formulated three team objectives during the months of preparation for the special advisement and registration. These were 1) to humanize the entire advisement and registration process; 2) to better identify and place Basic Studies students; and 3) to better advise all new students. The evaluations by the new students, by the administrators who observed and/or participated in the process, and by the advisors all indicated the team was successful in accomplishing its objectives. The retention data suggest encouraging trends which may reduce attrition. The team objectives, which are consistent with the project objectives, seem to have been fully met.

It is too soon to draw any absolute conclusions about the effect on retention of this new approach to advising and registering students, but the noticeably improved atmosphere at G.C.C. is clear. Registering students found G.C.C. a friendly place, with personnel interested in helping them and considerate of them.

The experience of the team in carrying out this project indicates that strong administrative support is essential to the success of such an activity. Faculty members do not have the authority to institute change of this type in the face of both campus resistance to change and the myriad problems that must be resolved. This support was evident throughout the project from the campus administration, but the team did not feel that the District decisively shared that view.

As a result of the project, the need for careful training of advisors and for detailed advising materials became evident. Due to the pressures of its work, the team was slow to realize this need, but by the time the new process was used in August the need had become clear. Part of this belated recognition was that the team's understanding of the needs of new students evolved

from seeing advising as an important part of the registration process, to seeing the registration process as a framework in which advising occurs. By the Fall of 1979 the team had shifted its emphasis from the registration process to the development of an effective advisement procedure for new students. The team's concern that proper advisor training should occur, and that good advising materials should be made available was an outcome of this shift in emphasis, and was reinforced by the evaluations of advisement by both the new students and the advisors.

Overall, the team ended the summer of 1979 with a feeling of having accomplished a difficult task successfully. They had the opportunity to participate in the creative development of a new process and to see it successfully carried out. For faculty such an opportunity is a fine learning experience, giving insight into the complexities of administration. The team's work generated even more ideas for improving advisement and registration in the future, and the team began the 1979-80 academic year with the enthusiastic intention to achieve these further improvements.

SUMMARY. This section has reviewed evaluations of the new advisement and registration process by faculty advisors, administrators, student workers, and registering students. Overall, the evaluations were favorable, although some modifications in the process were indicated. Retention data for the Fall, 1979 semester were also analyzed, and it was shown that, in general, the data were favorable. Finally, a brief evaluation by the project director emphasized the evolution of the team's concern with academic advisement, as contrasted with the registration process, and the team's enthusiasm about future improvements in the advisement of G.C.C. students. Part V will explain the work of the Advisement and Registration Committee which replaced the project team, and will provide recommendations for future development of effective advisement at G.C.C.

PART V

RECOMMENDATIONS BY PROJECT DIRECTOR

In this section, a brief account will be given of the work of the Advisement and Registration Committee during the 1979-80 academic year, and several recommendations for improved advisement will be made by the project director.

THE ADVISEMENT AND REGISTRATION COMMITTEE. The JCEP project team was delighted with the experimental advisement and registration in August 1979, and early in the Fall, 1979 semester the team met to formulate a recommendation to the Dean of Instruction and the Associate Dean, Student Personnel Services that a permanent committee be formed. The intent was to make it possible to continue the experimental process in the future. This recommendation was accepted by the G.C.C. administration with enthusiasm.

The new committee included all six members of the original team. The project director became the chairperson. In addition, the committee included the Associate Dean of Instruction for Occupational Education, and the Registration Office Manager. The Staff Development Coordinator (who had been one of the original team members) and the Associate Dean, Student Personnel Services served as ex officio members. An additional faculty member was added to the committee for the spring semester. Thus, the committee remained faculty dominated, although there were administrators on the committee.

The committee met frequently throughout the 1979-80 academic year. During the Fall, 1979 semester preparations were made for the January, 1980 new student advisement and registration. One major advance was the development of a Handbook for Advisors which provides needed information about campus resources, G.C.C. procedures and requirements, the registration process, and

specifically, the academic programs available. Although it will be revised and improved, in its present form it is an enormous improvement over past information available to advisors.

The committee did not initially realize the great amount of work involved in developing the Handbook. For example, for the section which details the academic programs offered at G.C.C., a questionnaire was developed and sent to department chairpersons or program directors and where possible, chairpersons were also interviewed. Then a standardized format was adopted for the write-up of the programs. Finally, each was typed in final form and a copy sent to the appropriate chairperson or director for verification of accuracy. That the committee succeeded in finishing the entire Handbook (over 230 pages of detailed information) in the Fall, 1979 semester, as well as preparing for the January, 1980 registration, is an indication of its strong commitment to good advisement. Once again, members put in long hours - without any extra pay or reassigned time - to accomplish their goals.

Because of its concern that advisement be improved, the committee also developed and implemented a more intensive training for all January, 1980 advisors. These advisors were all volunteers, and most of those who advised in August were in the group. The advisor training consisted of three sessions, each offered twice to accomodate other professional commitments of the faculty members. The first session was an overview of the new process, G.C.C. requirements, etc. The second and third sessions were conducted individually for each advising cluster and covered all the programs assigned to that particular cluster. Overall, the training sessions were not entirely successful. Some of the advisors felt overwhelmed by the material; some did not feel they needed the training.

During the Spring, 1980 semester, the committee analyzed the available data on retention of new students, planned further improvements in the advising

and registration process, began some longitudinal research on student retention, and attempted to meet criticisms of the new process raised by some of the faculty. The chairperson of the committee received six hours of reassigned time, which significantly reduced time pressures on her. In general, committee members were not heavily overworked, although time commitments for this committee continued to be more demanding than for other campus committees.

RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE PROJECT DIRECTOR/COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON. Based on her analysis of the project, the project director recommends several procedures which might strengthen the process of entrance and retention for new community college students.

1. The college must formulate a clear concept of academic advisement. The literature indicates that academic advising is typically not defined by colleges, and the prevailing college impression is that it primarily involves assisting students to register for classes in their declared major field. Yet, research indicates that a good percentage of college students are really undecided about their career and life goals. A clear definition of the role of advising would help meet the needs of the student. Advisement ought to emphasize the importance of helping the student examine and clarify life, career, and academic goals and, within that context, guidance in choosing programs and courses should occur.

2. Strong administrative support is necessary for a successful advisement program. It is highly likely that faculty resistance to a change in the advisement procedure will occur, and there must be clear and consistent support from the administration. The new system must be given time to prove itself, prpbably several years. It is reasonable to expect mistakes at first,

but there must be an administrative commitment to allow the time to correct these, and to improve the system in general without premature conclusions about its potential value.

3. A cluster approach to advisement of new students is valuable. Given a registration process which effectively supports it, the cluster system has decided advantages over departmental advising of new students. The emphasis is on the needs of the students rather than on departmental concerns. The undecided student is more likely to find the guidance needed. A side benefit is that the advisors working in clusters increase their understanding of programs and courses other than in their own departments. However, such a system must be given time to evolve. It is possible that at first it will be perceived by advisors as threatening because it requires that they master considerable new material. Given time, advisors should gain confidence about their own abilities to advise in a capable and knowledgeable way, and the benefits of focusing on the student rather than on departmental concerns will occur.

4. Thorough training of faculty advisors is essential. New students need careful and accurate guidance, and this requires good understanding of the nature of advisement on the part of advisors, as well as mastery of a great deal of information. A thorough training program for advisors should include a review of all necessary advising information, but especially it should concentrate on helping advisors understand the broader needs of students who come to them. Techniques for interviewing students in a non-threatening and supportive way should also be demonstrated to advisors. An effective training program may have to be built slowly due to initial resistance on the part of faculty who may believe they do not need training, but such training is

essential in order to develop effective advising skills and to provide students with accurate information.

5. Adequate advising materials must be available. There is too much information needed for effective advising, particularly with a cluster system, to expect advisors to know it all. Good reference materials are essential. An advisor handbook which gives this information in a clear and accurate manner is an effective tool. In addition, a reference handbook giving detailed information about individual courses would be of benefit not only to advisors, but to students.

6. After the experimental period in which the process of advisement is developed, the process should be institutionalized. A coordinator of advising should be named and an office of advisement should be developed. This allows for continuing improvement of the process, combined with a permanent center for all advising functions of the college. An advisory committee should be named to assist the coordinator.

7. Formal advising should be available for all students throughout their college experience. Once an effective advising system for new students has been developed, a broader system should be instituted which makes continued advisement available to students. Each student should have the opportunity to develop a continuing relationship with a permanent faculty advisor, who would have all pertinent records about that student, and who could serve as a friendly and knowledgeable guide. If the student has decided on a major, this advisor should be in that department. However, advisors for students who remain undecided should also be available.

8. A research project on the effect of advising should be carried out. The college should carry out extensive research on the effect of its advising program on retention of students and on student satisfaction with advisement. Such a project should include the analysis of retention data each semester, surveys of student reactions to advisement, and a longitudinal study which follows samples of the student population over at least several semesters. In this way, information will become available about the effectiveness of the entire advisement program which will aid in future improvements.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS. The above eight recommendations are not all-inclusive, but the experience of the project director in the past year suggests that these provide a good basis for progress beyond the initial steps taken at G.C.C. to improve its advisement system and thus better meet the needs of its students. Thus, a clear concept of what academic advising is, strong administrative support for advisement, a cluster approach in advising new students, thorough training of advisors, adequate advising materials, an institutionalized office of advisement, a formal advisement program for continuing students, and ongoing research should all be implemented.

SUMMARY

This paper has reviewed the development and implementation of an experimental advisement and registration process for new students at Glendale Community College in the summer of 1979, evaluated that process, and presented recommendations for future improvements in academic advising.

Part I discussed several trends in the Maricopa County Community College District and at G.C.C. which made this project appropriate. The project, the team who worked on it, and the goals of the team were also described.

Part II discussed the development of all aspects of the new registration process, and included some critical comments about weaknesses in some of these. Difficulties which the project team faced while doing its work were also explained, and implications drawn.

Part III discussed the many written materials which were developed. These included materials used in training both faculty advisors and student helpers, materials used by advisors during advisement, materials for registering students, and a variety of evaluation forms.

Part IV discussed evaluations of the process by advisors, administrators, student workers, and registering students. Retention data for the Fall, 1979 semester were also evaluated and found favorable. A brief evaluation by the project director was included.

Part V briefly discussed the development of an Advisement and Registration Committee as the outgrowth of the original project team, and indicated the major work of that committee during the 1979-80 academic year. This section also included eight recommendations by the project director for an effective advisement program.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES
96 POWELL LIBRARY BUILDING
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024

MAR 20 1981